



Gilmore 00346 T
P 1: 1058

Al Shuhada' [The Martyrs]

Monthly Bulletin Published by Political Guidance
for the Border-Region Forces

[Photographic image of Yasser 'Arafat making the "V for Victory" sign, against background-inset image of Al Aqsa Mosque]

My Dream Shall Be Fulfilled
Only With You, Oh Jerusalem

Gilmore 00346 T
P 1: 1058

[AI Shuhada', Vol. 28, p. 3]

Translator's Notes:

Where flow of English necessitated phrasing supplemental to wording in the original/source, such supplemental phrasing was supplied between straight brackets.

Essential explanatory material, including the identities of personalities or entities signaled by vaguely-directed personal pronouns, was supplied between italicized brackets, whenever the intended personality or entity could be ascertained from context.

Gilmore 00347 T
P 1: 1059

Introductory Remarks for th[is] Volume

And the Battle Has Begun

by Ah [Photograph of Author] las

A call . . . A call . . . A call . . . , from our negotiating delegation headed by our emblematic Commander Abu 'Ammar [*Yasser 'Arafat*] to our heroic Palestinian people, [exhorting], "Get ready, for the battle of Jerusalem has begun." This is what the return of the Palestinian delegation to the territory of the homeland indicates is coming next, out of Camp David, without [any] wavering from fixed and openly-stated Palestinian principles. There [shall be] no peace without Jerusalem as the eternal capital of the State of Palestine, and no stability or security in the entire region without Israel granting the legitimate international demands that require that there be land for peace, in accordance with U.N. Resolutions. When Barak has promised his constituents that he will adhere to his 'No's' [*refusals*], he [has been] deluded. If he believes that we are prepared to forsake our fixed nationalistic principles, foremost among them noble Jerusalem, this holy city within and around which God has [provided his] blessing, then he [*Barak*] has not grasped the reality that our Palestinian people, even if they chose a 'hero's peace,' would never reach the point of giving up their historical right to their holy city, which blood and souls have watered. If only Barak would comprehend the experience of his Zionist-leader predecessors, then he would shed the falsity of his belief in the necessity of

Gilmore 00347 T
P 1: 1059
(continued)

control over Jerusalem; but in reality, he is still ruled by imperialist, occupationist Zionist thinking, and this is what his election program, on the basis of which he won the recent elections, bespeaks. What he claims to be his love of peace has come only within the framework of this [Zionist] thinking, which is completely contradictory to the reality of peace, and [to] the meaning of coexistence [between] peoples. He has believed that our people shall surrender to the settlers' terms that he is dictating on the strength of the element of military and economic force that he possesses. In this, he has not grasped that our people, with their few capabilities, are great in their will, and shall not be subjected to dictates and to robbery, even if the U.S. is a strong backer of Israel's negotiating delegation. The extraordinary bearing of the emblematic Commander Abu 'Ammar, and the adherence to fixed principles supported by the [Palestinian] peoples' stance, have been the steel that the Palestinian populace, across all political orientations, have evinced . The people have united behind their leader, blessing his steadfastness, and shouting, in spirit and in blood, "We are of service to you, oh Palestine." In their eyes is a determination to stand firmly in defense of their nationalist rights (which are demarcated [in law] without limitation by occupationist arrogance) with a will that does not relent. Every one of them is sharpening his zeal and preparing himself to enter a new phase that the factual circumstances of coming months may bring to bear, since declaration of the [Palestinian] State, with noble Jerusalem as its capital, shall take place, and the meaning of this is that the decisive battle has begun, and great things may happen. If our lawful rights are not addressed, with all that this entails, while souls are filled with glory and pride in the nationalist steadfastness exemplified in the stance of our negotiating delegation when they would not retreat from the fixed national principles that our people have supported through their institutions - - and if a miracle through which our nationalist demands are carried out does not come to pass - - then the battle shall be hard, and the Israeli and Palestinian peoples shall pay its price exorbitantly. We would not hope for occurrence of a collision but for [the fact] that we shall not forsake [even] a grain of sand of the soil of Jerusalem. We shall see what the days ahead shall bring about from it *[the collision]*, for declaration of materialization of an independent Palestinian state is inevitably coming, and

Gilmore 00347 T
P 1: 1059
(continued)

our people are enjoying [this] in a spirit of high morale, with readiness to confront all possibilities. And so we embark boldly on the holiest of battles, the battle of Jerusalem. Even around the negotiations table, we shall back our delegation, support our leader, and declare our preparedness to be[come] martyrdom projects and forearms of building -- building of the future state. And we shall achieve our aspirations, God willing and thanks to our national unity, on the day when believers shall rejoice in God's victory. And God is with those who are patient.

[AI Shuhada' *[The Martyrs]*] Monthly bulletin published by Political Guidance for the Border-Region Forces - Volume (28) - 3rd Year - July 2000

[P.] 3

[AI Shuhada', Vol. 28, p. 4]

Translator's Notes:

Where flow of English necessitated phrasing supplemental to wording in the original/source, such supplemental phrasing was supplied between straight brackets.

Essential explanatory material, including the identities of personalities or entities signaled by vaguely-directed personal pronouns, was supplied between italicized brackets, whenever the intended personality or entity could be ascertained from context.

Gilmore 00348 T
P 1: 1060

A Word [About] th[is] Volume

“My Dream Shall Be Fulfilled Only With You, Oh Jerusalem”

by Ahmad Ibrahim Halas

Political Commissioner for the Border-Region Forces

Thus has spoken [our] emblematic Commander Abu ‘Ammar [Yasser ‘Arafat], and with him [in this] are all the Palestinian people - - Muslims and Christians, because Jerusalem is the soul, heart, and eternal capital of the Palestinian state, and without Jerusalem, the dream remains unfulfilled, and the homeland [remains] without a heart. Without Jerusalem, there shall be no peace, however much Barak and others like him may try, for the matter is settled, insofar as our people are concerned, factually, historically, bindingly, and in terms of [our] will. Accordingly, any solution that omits [disposition of] Jerusalem cannot be amenable to implementation, and the region shall be primed for explosion at any time, for peace rests on Jerusalem and war rests on Jerusalem, and the situation cannot be saved without handing over Palestinian[s’] rights to Jerusalem. Anyone who imagines that this holy Palestinian city [*Jerusalem*] shall be outside the sphere of Palestinian sovereignty is deluded, and does not know the reality of this people, doesn’t understand its character, and doesn’t grasp the extent of its unyieldingness, [or] its capacity to bear burdens, [or] what it [*the Palestinian people*] possesses in the way of will and strong, unshakable faith; because this city is in the psyche of every Palestinian, and to it they aspire. Without it, independence would be like a body without a head, and without a heart.

Gilmore 00348 T

P 1: 1060

(continued)

How can our people accept a peace that does not achieve, for them, the attributes of sovereignty, the primary one of which is its capital? How can our people approve of a substitute capital, and at the same time, sign a peace accord? !!! Our negotiating delegation led by Brother Abu ‘Ammar has clarified for the American side, and also for [the] Israeli [side], that the red

line that cannot be transgressed or be [made subject to] negotiation over possible infringement is Jerusalem and [the right of] return. It is foolish to talk about matters that do not conform to these aspirations. In fact, this is a trying and difficult phase, with a war around the negotiations table and in locked rooms. But the will that is not defeated, and the patience that does not relent, and the political position that is capable [even] of encompassing all orientations that are not in keeping with our rights and the aspirations of our people (these people who today claim a serious and unified position behind their leadership and negotiating delegation, and who also claim caution and an effort towards achievement of national unity that may [serve] as backing, and moral and material support, for our brothers who are embarking boldly into a heated battle at Camp David) - - the results of these *[will, patience, and political tolerance]* shall influence the future of the region, whether these [results] are negative or positive. And so here are our people, with all their virtues, [social] strata, and political orientations, monitoring the situation and the matter in relation to themselves. They shall be limited to one of two scenarios, either peace, or collision, blood[shed], and misfortunes, with both sides being consumed by their fire. With regard to us, we the Palestinian people do not have anything to offer, for we have chosen peace for land, in accordance with international legal resolutions, and peace is conditional on [Palestinian] national sovereignty over the land that was occupied in 1967. But Barak wants peace without leaving Palestinian territory, as required by the international resolutions that stipulate the impermissibility of occupying the lands of others by force, and this is a delusion that he has every hope will materialize in reality. In this, he has not understood the lesson that Rabin, Netanyahu, and Perez learned, for our will is firm, and our stones are many, and our faith in our truth does not abate. Hence, the political situation in the region depends on the Israeli position, and [only] on the basis of it *[the Israeli position]* shall the fate of peace be determined. We have

Gilmore 00348 T
P 1: 1060
(continued)

extended our hands towards peace, trusting that our people shall not haggle over their right[s], and that [they] shall be like a solid edifice, [standing] in single file behind their leadership, in order to move in both [possible] directions *[peace or collision]*. If Israel cracks at the call to peace, our people shall be ready to give and to build, building an independent state with noble Jerusalem as its capital. And if the opposite should occur, we shall be ready to defend and protect our rights with our blood. The Palestinian bond shall be permanent, and shall continue until truth comes into its own, and what is false is nullified. President 'Arafat's position at the Camp David negotiations is but a condensed expression of the position of every Palestinian citizen, for the dream of *all* of us can be fulfilled only with you, oh Jerusalem.

[Al Shuhada' [The Martyrs]] Monthly bulletin published by Political Guidance for the Border-Region Forces - Volume (28) - 3rd Year - July 2000

[P.] 4

[Al Shuhada', Vol. 28, pp. 5-7]

Translator's Notes:

Where flow of English necessitated phrasing supplemental to wording in the original/source, such supplemental phrasing was supplied between straight brackets.

Essential explanatory material, including the identities of personalities or entities signaled by vaguely-directed personal pronouns, was supplied between italicized brackets, whenever the intended personality or entity could be ascertained from context.

Gilmore 00349 T
P 1: 1061

News . . and Commentary

for the
Unit

by [Photograph
of Author] da
sioner
arters

An End and A Beginning

No sooner had news arrived that the Camp David summit had ended in failure than Palestinians heaved a sigh of relief, after 15 days of worry, confusion, and fear that their fate was being decided at a summit in and around which there was a confluence of circumstances exerting pressure on the Palestinian delegation.

The fear stemmed from a spontaneous assessment that was nearly unanimous, to the effect that [current] terms for producing a solution to the Palestinian issue were not yielding the possibility of deriving an agreement, resonant with fixed nationalistic principles, that would be [even] minimally acceptable within the framework of an historical bargain that ends the fighting.

The summit having concluded in this outcome, negotiations may [now] have reached *their* end, and spontaneously, the political solution has entered [the phase] of a hiatus, pending occurrence of anything that might be able to put an end to this hiatus. Absent this [*such an occurrence*], it [*a solution*] cannot come into being.

Gilmore 00349 T
P 1: 1061
(continued)

[At] Camp David, the negotiations were not an ordinary scenario, in the context of negotiations that had continued over a cycle of six years, and possibly more. On the contrary, they were extraordinary. What I am driving at [here] is that [usually], there is an end to fighting, preceded by completion of a political solution, preceded, in turn, by the conclusion of negotiations. What I am getting at is something other than what happened here, for they [*the Camp David negotiations*] led only to an agreement to end the fighting, and not to an agreement for a [political] solution. The difference between the[se] two [types of] agreements has been present since the moment the two parties entered into them [at] Camp David. Barak went there, and behind him was a single objective: an agreement to *stop* the fighting by any solution possible. He pushed the Palestinians to accept it [*the agreement*] through coercion and pressure or inveiglement. ‘Arafat went with the objective, behind him, of a solution that would *lead to* an end to the fighting. Between these two [disparate] objectives, the negotiation [took the form of] each party seeking to place his objective in the foreground, and the result was that the two objectives remained [operative] in the background, with ‘Arafat not agreeing with Barak to end the fighting, and the latter [*Barak*] not agreeing to ‘Arafat’s solution. Division [then] ensued.

The Americans, who were guided, in their negotiation intervention, by the Oslo Agreement, which married continuation of the occupation, and all its manifestations, to a temporary solution, failed to conclude wedding ceremonies between Barak’s ending the fighting and ‘Arafat’s solution, because the prior marriage was tantamount to a betrothal amenable to all possibilities, whereas the marriage that the Americans wanted to conclude was a Catholic marriage, [in which] the signature means

[Al Shuhada’ [The Martyrs]] Monthly bulletin published by Political Guidance for the Border-Region Forces - Volume (28) - 3rd Year - July 2000

[P.] 5

Gilmore 00350 T
P 1: 1062

the undertaking [of commitments] without possibilities. This [meant] an end to the conjoining of the [issue of] fighting, to the convening of all but negligible negotiation[s], and to regional and international variables going back ten years into the past, which were present in the mind of Americans. An outcome like this opens the doors to their [*negotiations'*] end, in the face of a search for their soul, but the only 'door' was that the Camp David summit was an effort by the three parties to prevent circumstances from slipping out of their hands, for they were wanting to steer clear of the explosion, or to expend [one] last effort before the explosion.

Sometimes, and in the face of objective variables on the ground and in people, the decision-maker finds himself in the dilemma of [having to] make a decision between being favorable to these variables, or standing against them. [Both] of these responses have their negative outcomes, and for this reason, a search is undertaken for the less negative one. If the Americans have gained access to a conduit through the information that is reaching them [indicating] that the variables in the relationship between the Palestinian and Israeli parties have reached the point of explosion, despite the halt of [its] [*the explosion's*] execution, [then] this is what was behind the decision to convene the summit, despite Palestinians' reservations, which were not embraced, due to calculations (opinions and dispositions) that may have appeared close to the Palestinian refrain, but which were, in reality, far [from it].

In convening the summit, the Americans relied on it, and believed that basically, it would be what would determine the Palestinian refrain, in the end. It was for this reason, perhaps, that Barak insisted upon convening the failed summit, because the calculations of the Americans, and, before them, the calculations of the Israelis, were a world apart from the Palestinian position, which was armed with the most comprehensively invested total, and not [merely] partial, faith in attainment of whatever agreement there might be. The summit failed for the sole reason that the Israelis did not reach a phase of readiness and maturity (given that they had to pick up the occupation of 1967 and leave Palestinian territory, with all they have [there] in the way of settlement [operations], repression, and terrorism); [and the summit failed for that reason] only.

Through Barak at Camp David, they [*the Israelis*] attempted to stand in the middle of the road, [halfway] between ending and continuing the occupation.

This is the reason behind Palestinian wariness of the decision [to hold] the summit, which was cooked while the fire was hot, for it is natural that the end be unnatural. But the most important thing [to come out] of the summit, at the present moment, is what [comes] after the summit, and what [comes] after the summit is not what [came] before it, despite the failure loophole, which was the equivalent of an appeasement message devoid of [real] content, [conveying that] the summit, within the reality in which it took place, was an effort by the three parties to prevent developments in the relationship between the Palestinian and Israeli parties from turning into collision and confrontation. In the temporal context, the attempt was the last one.

On this point, the failure [took the form] of a dramatic end to the variables on the ground, especially in light of what will [now] happen between the Palestinian and Israeli parties, and, similarly, to the American party, who cannot retreat from its [own] interest[s], or from itself, as a nation [that is] unique and the most powerful [one] in the world. What will happen, first off, is that there will appear to be indications from the parties in the direction of de-escalation and avoiding confrontation, perhaps in anticipation that something may transpire during the coming month of August. But if

[Al Shuhada' [The Martyrs]] Monthly bulletin published by Political Guidance for the Border-Region Forces - Volume (28) - 3rd Year - July 2000

[P.] 6

Gilmore 00351 T
P 1: 1063

negotiations, [held] at a level [at which] the resolve of [even] the most distinguished [representatives] of the parties was lost, failed to achieve any agreement, how can negotiations at lower levels lead us to success?!

The answer is in the negative, and the meaning of waiting, in this case, is a waste of time, and nothing more. The realities and facts, [both] on the ground and in policy, locally, regionally, and internationally, excreted the failure at Camp David, and the Israelis dug in behind their opinions and positions, and the Palestinians did likewise, without the American intermediary succeeding, through any of its middle-ground proposals, in bringing [matters] a single step closer to conciliation of positions. Preliminary information about what transpired at Camp David indicates that the range of agreement was marginal, and that [matters] moved not a single step closer to the essence surrounding any of the issues, only one [of these being] Jerusalem, which had been the focus of the media.

In the face of this, the failure heralds the end of the political solution, and it is an end that is open to the option of confrontation and collision. That is a beginning, in that it is the natural beginning to the end of political solution as a way of achieving the goal of the Palestinian people to become liberated from occupation, and the goal of the Israelis to continue the occupation. And if it is in the interest of Arab states for the current situation to remain in place, the interest of Palestinians is in changing this situation, especially given that the variables [of] confiscation of land and settlement [operations] do not permit them to wait, for either a long or short period. Thus has come about the decision to declare establishment of the Palestinian state on the land, this coming September 13th, as a measure that is natural for a people who desires its freedom and [its] deliverance from the occupation.

If confrontation is not a Palestinian option, but Palestinians have the right to defend themselves, then what shall be?

There is a second coming.

What Security Council Resolution 242 Promulgated on November 22, 1967 Stipulates

The Resolution provides for a comprehensive solution to all the problems in the Middle East, with the objective of establishing a just and lasting peace there, in the context of which every nation in this region may live a secure life. The Resolution affirms the impermissibility of acquiring territories through war, and pursuant to this principle, the Resolution requires the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories that it occupied during the recent conflict. It also [requires] desistance from all [belligerent] claims, an end to the state of war, and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every nation in the region, along with respect for their right to live in peace within secure borders recognized as being [entitled to] freedom from imposition of the danger of the threat and use of force. Similarly, the Resolution affirms the necessity of securing freedom of navigation in international waterways in this region, and accomplishing a just settlement of the problem of the refugees.

[Al Shuhada' [The Martyrs]] Monthly bulletin published by Political Guidance for the Border-Region Forces - Volume (28) - 3rd Year - July 2000

[P.] 7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MARK I. SOKOLOW, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE PALESTINE LIBERATION
ORGANIZATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 04 Civ. 00397 (GBD) (RLE)

DECLARATION OF LUCILLE KAPLAN

I, Lucille Kaplan, hereby certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746(1), as follows:

1. The attached translation from Arabic to English is an accurate representation of the document I received, to the best of my knowledge and belief. The document is designated as P 1: 1058-1063.
2. I am a professional translator with an A.B. degree in Near Eastern Studies from Princeton University and a J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School. I am certified to Professional Performance Level in Modern Standard Arabic (“MSA”)- to- English Translation through U.S. Interagency Language Roundtable Professional Qualification Examination testing. My formal MSA studies include over eight years of U.S.-based training and completion of a fellowship at the American University of Cairo. I am qualified to translate accurately from Arabic to English.

3. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the accompanying text is a true, full, and accurate translation of the Arabic-language document bearing the bates number P 1: 1058-1063.

Dated: March 2, 2014



LUCILLE KAPLAN

